

## REMARKS

Claims 1, 8, 15, 21, 29, 30, and 37 have been amended to clarify the subject matter regarded as the invention. Claims 1-44 are pending.

The Examiner has rejected claims 1-44 under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mattis in view of Cloutier. Mattis teaches detecting duplicate objects in a caching environment. Cloutier teaches generating a unique code for a message that allows access to content of the message. Mattis and Cloutier do not teach, either singularly or in combination, a single shared index file associated with multiple “electronic mail recipients”, and determining “based upon whether the message tag is found in the single shared index file” whether a message is not a duplicate message, as amended in claim 1.

Specifically, Cloutier does not teach an index file of message tags associated with multiple users, and although Mattis teaches a tag table, the tag table is not associated with messages received by multiple users. Additionally, Mattis teaches generating two keys, a name key and an object key, for an object. The name key of Mattis is used to reference indexed objects, and the object key is used to detect duplicate objects. Col. 8 lines 8-10 of Mattis recites, “Name keys are used to index metadata about a named object, and object keys are used to index true object content.” Since the “metadata about a named object” (properties of the named object) is not used in generating the object key, detecting duplicate objects using the object key does not include using a message tag computed from “at least a portion of the plurality of **message properties**” to detect a duplicate message as recited in claim 1. As such, claim 1 is believed to be allowable.

Claims 2-7 depend from claim 1 and are believed to be allowable for the same reasons described above.

Mattis and Cloutier, neither singularly nor in combination, teaches a single shared index file associated with multiple “electronic mail recipients”, and comparing the second message tag with the first message tag “to determine whether the second message is not a duplicate message with at least the same sender’s name and the same sender’s submission time as the first message” as amended in claim 8. As such, claim 8 is believed to be allowable for the same reasons described above.

Claims 9-14 depend from claim 8 and are believed to be allowable for the same reasons described above.

Mattis and Cloutier, neither singularly nor in combination, teaches a single shared index file associated with multiple “electronic mail recipients”, and determining “based upon whether the message tag is found in the single shared index” that the message is not a duplicate message already stored in a message archive, as amended in claim 15. As such, claim 15 is believed to be allowable for the same reasons described above.

Claims 16-20 depend from claim 15 and are believed to be allowable for the same reasons described above.

Mattis and Cloutier, neither singularly nor in combination, teaches a single shared index file associated with multiple “electronic mail recipients”, and a duplicate checker that determines a message is a duplicate message “with at least same said two message properties as another message” already stored in a message archive, as amended in claim 21. As such, claim 21 is believed to be allowable for the same reasons described above.

Claims 22-29 depend from claim 21 and are believed to be allowable for the same reasons described above.

Mattis and Cloutier, neither singularly nor in combination, teaches a single shared index file associated with multiple “electronic mail recipients”, and comparing the second message tag with the first message tag “to determine whether the second message is not a duplicate message with at least the same sender’s name and the same sender’s submission time as the first message” as amended in claim 30. As such, claim 30 is believed to be allowable for the same reasons described above.

Claims 31-36 depend from claim 30 and are believed to be allowable for the same reasons described above.

Mattis and Cloutier, neither singularly nor in combination, teaches a single shared index file associated with “messages received by” multiple users, and a duplicate checker that indicates to the archive server that the message is a duplicate message “with at least same said two

message properties as another message" already stored in the archive message store, as amended in claim 37. As such, claim 37 is believed to be allowable for the same reasons described above.

Claims 38-44 depend from claim 37 and are believed to be allowable for the same reasons described above.

Reconsideration of the application and allowance of all claims are respectfully requested based on the preceding remarks. If at any time the Examiner believes that an interview would be helpful, please contact the undersigned.

Dated: 9/14/06

Respectfully submitted,

  
Jong Andrew H. Park  
Registration No. 56,917  
V 408-973-2577  
F 408-973-2595

VAN PELT, YI & JAMES LLP  
10050 N. Foothill Blvd., Suite 200  
Cupertino, CA 95014